SOCIAL SCIENCES

LIBRARY
FEB 18 1957
DETROIT

20 Cents
February 23, 1957

NATIONAL REVIEW

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

Neutralization and Liberal Assumptions

WM. F. BUCKLEY, JR.

Chicago: The Opposition Speaks

REVILO OLIVER

Rebirth of the Popular Front?

TOWNER PHELAN

Articles and Reviews by · · · · · · JOHN CHAMBERLAIN
L. BRENT BOZELL · ANTHONY LEJEUNE · JAMES BURNHAM
WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM · SAM M. JONES · FRANK S. MEYER

NATIONAL REVIEW

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

EDITOR and PUBLISHER: Wm. F. Buckley, Jr.

EDITORS

L. Brent Bozell — James Burnham
John Chamberlain — Willmoore Kendall
Suzanne La Follette — William S. Schlamm

PRODUCTION EDITOR: Mabel Wood

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT: Sam M. Jones

ASSOCIATES

Priscilla L. Buckley — Frank S. Meyer
Jonathan Mitchell — Morrie Ryskind

CONTRIBUTORS

C. D. Batchelor, John C. Caldwell, Frank Chodorov, John Abbot Clark, Forrest Davis, A. Derso, Max Eastman, Medford Evans, Karl Hess, John D. Kreuttner, J. B. Matthews, Gerhart Niemeyer, Revilo Oliver, E. Merrill Root, Freda Utley, Richard M. Weaver, Gen. Charles A. Willoughby

FOREIGN CONTRIBUTORS

Geneva: Wilhelm Roepke — *Madrid*: J. Dervin
Munich: E. v. Kuehnelt-Leddihn

BUSINESS MANAGER: Theodore A. Driscoll

ASSISTANT TO THE PUBLISHER: J. P. McFadden

Contents FEBRUARY 23, 1957 VOL. III, NO. 8

THE WEEK 170

ARTICLES

Neutralization and Liberal Assumptions — Wm. F. Buckley, Jr. 177
Chicago: The Opposition Speaks — Revilo Oliver 181
Rebirth of the Popular Front? — Towner Phelan 183

DEPARTMENTS

For the Record 171
National Trends — L. Brent Bozell 175
Letter from London — Anthony Lejeune 179
From Washington Straight — Sam M. Jones 180
The Third World War — James Burnham 185
Arts and Manners — William S. Schlamm 186
To the Editor 190

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Nostalgia for Heroes — John Chamberlain 187
Masks of Communism — Frank S. Meyer 188
A Joke on the French — Revilo Oliver 189
Reviewed in Brief — Roger Becket 189

NATIONAL REVIEW is published weekly, except second and third weeks in August, at Orange, Conn., by National Weekly, Inc.

Copyrighted 1957 in the U.S.A. by National Weekly, Inc.

Second-class mail privileges authorized at Orange, Conn.

EDITORIAL AND SUBSCRIPTION OFFICES:
211 East 37th St.
New York 16, N. Y.
Telephone: MUrray Hill 2-0941

RATES, Twenty cents a copy, $7.00 a year, $13.00 for two years. Foreign, $9.00 a year; Canada, $8.00 a year.

The editors cannot be responsible for unsolicited manuscripts unless return postage, or better, a stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed. Opinions expressed in signed articles do not necessarily represent the views of the editors.

The WEEK

● The other day, Friend Zhukov expressed his suspicion, in India, that Friend Eisenhower is no longer what he used to be. This, if one considers the underpinning of Mr. Eisenhower's foreign policy, is tantamount to an earthquake. For all the President ever had to offer as a rationale for the coexistence binge of Geneva was his fond recollection of the toasts he had shared, in the golden days of World War Two, with that upright soldier, that hearty scholar, that sentimental family man, Marshal Zhukov. The following two years, until yesterday in fact, Mr. Eisenhower based his cherubic serenity about world peace on his reassuring intimacy with Zhukov. Now this is gone. Zhukov has begun to speak of Mr. Eisenhower as if the latter were President of the United States. May one hope that Mr. Eisenhower will start to speak of Zhukov as if he were the highest officer of the rapacious Red Army?

● The distinctions between ideas, principles and expedients prey upon the mind of Maryland's Governor Theodore R. McKeldin. In a speech before the Queens Village Club he charged that the only thing Republican that is worth the nation's while is Eisenhower; that the Party suffers from a deficiency in new ideas; that, therefore, the Party must wholeheartedly adopt Eisenhower's ideas. Then the Governor entered into the knottiest of all the problems involved: the marks by which Eisenhower's ideas can be recognized. First, Eisenhower's ideas do *not* deny traditional Republican principles; they deny "the outworn junk that outworn minds mistook for principles." Second, Eisenhower's ideas are not necessarily incorporated in his program; for the President's expedients must not be confused with his principles. Third, "native American realism" (or expediency) is what the Party needs and what Eisenhower has. So, the Governor concludes, in quest of the Eisenhower idea, the Party should grow expedient. Well, there's an idea for you!

● Inquiries about the following should be addressed to the Ultima Ratio Department of the United Nations. The reason why the Security Council of the United Nations has not passed a resolution condemning the mutilation of Hungary by the Soviet Union is that the Soviet Union vetoed the proposed resolution. And the Soviet Union was permitted to veto that resolution because, after deliberation, the Hun-

garian crisis was deemed a "situation" rather than a "dispute." For if it had been a "dispute," the Soviet Union, as a party to that dispute, would not, under the Charter, have been permitted a vote. Ho hum. We look forward to the match between Gene Fullmer and Sugar Ray next month, a match that should be quite a situation—or should we call it a dispute?

● In a recent speech to the Export Managers Club, Mr. Franz Pick, the international currency expert, pointed out that the Egyptian pound, officially valued in parity with the British pound at $2.87, has fallen in the past six months to $1.70-$1.80 in free market transactions. Mr. Pick concluded: "If it goes as low as $1.50, then the hour glass will have run out for Mr. Nasser."

● The news that the American Communist Party, meeting in solemn conclave, had voted "two to one" to assert their formal independence from the Communist line as laid down in Moscow somehow took us back to the halcyon years of the nineteen thirties, when Joe Gould, the sweet balladist of Fourteenth Street, was singing a song that began:

> From Russia Earl Browder
> Is getting divorscht,
> He prefers clam chowder
> To noodles and borscht.

It also reminded us of the man on the stage who had the well-behaved dog. "Do what you want to," he would command the dog. Then, when the dog stood immobile, waiting for a cue, the man would say to the audience, "See how well he minds?"

● For the past six months William Z. Foster, chairman of the U.S. Communist Party, has personally and quite energetically led the extreme pro-Moscow wing of the Party. But Foster's trial under the Smith Act continues in the suspension granted five years ago, on the plea that serious heart trouble makes it impossible for the poor old man to stand the rigors of the courtroom.

● Harry Bridges is a symbol of the ineffectiveness of the existing complex of anti-Communist laws and institutions to cope with the enemy in our midst. Here is a man powerful enough to immobilize—repeat, immobilize—American shipping; who has stated that he would not cooperate in any conflict with the Soviet Union; and who moves about the land free to do exactly what he announced he would—namely, to immobilize American shipping, and to immobilize America in any conflict with the Soviet Union.

● In a Lincoln's Day address before the Illinois State Bar Association, ex-Governor James F. Byrnes of South Carolina declared: "If the Court shall declare unconstitutional all state statutes having in its opinion the effect of continuing segregation, then with great regret many states will discontinue public schools." Quite apart from the problem of segregation, a number of educators are inclined to believe that desocializing is about the best thing that could happen to American education.

● There was no question that David J. McDonald would continue as President of the United Steelworkers of America; and we do not contend that the union's voters chose unwisely. But the first general election for the presidency of the United Steelwork-

For the Record

Georgia's Senate unanimously passed a resolution asking Congress to declare the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments null and void. It contends that the refusal of the post-Civil-War Congresses to seat duly elected representatives of Southern states rendered them "nothing more than private assemblages unlawfully attempting to exercise the legislative power of the United States." . . . Governor James Folsom of Alabama charged that the Army's interference in National Guard training is but the first maneuver in a struggle to take complete control. . . . Secretary of the Air Force Donald A. Quarles is expected to succeed Charles Wilson as Secretary of Defense; and if the rotation system is honored, Air Force General Twining will succeed Admiral Radford as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But President Eisenhower might find it impolitic to appoint Air Force men to both key positions. . . . In 1956 non-agricultural employment averaged 1.5 million higher than in 1955. But in January 1.66 million employees lost their jobs—the most serious seasonal decline in eight years. . . . Before a House subcommittee on education, a witness accused the federal government of channeling state funds away from schools by requiring the states to match federal aid to highway construction and to health and welfare programs. . . . The Commodity Credit Corporation reports that from 1933-1953, direct farm price supports cost the government $1.1 billion a year; from 1953 to 1956, $2.9 billion. . . . Senators Knowland and Bridges predict that Congress will trim $2 billion off the federal budget, primarily from the $4.3 billion marked for foreign aid. . . . As General Curtis LeMay told a group of cadets, the Soviet Union has developed its long-range nuclear weapons and its continental air defense system so dramatically in the last five years that the U.S. must sustain serious damage in case of war. But today, he added, we still have the edge on the USSR.

ers of America held since 1936 was not a just contest. The rank-and-file candidate, Mr. Donald Rarick, protested the decision of the recent steelworkers' convention to hike dues from three to five dollars a month and to raise Mr. McDonald's salary from forty to fifty thousand dollars a year. In order to defeat him, the officers of the union spent over a million dollars of the members' money to persuade them to return the incumbent oligarchy to office. Perhaps the AFL-CIO will consider the ethics of this technique at its next meeting.

● The Congress of Mr. Nenni's Italian Socialist Party has ended with a triumphant defeat, or a defeating triumph, for Mr. Nenni. For, while the Congress endorsed his proposal of seeking Socialist unity with Mr. Saragat's anti-Communist Social Democrats, it also rejected Mr. Nenni's reiterated bid for control of the executive committee. In fact, Mr. Nenni is no longer in control of his Party. A hitherto unknown young man, representing the left wing of the left wing, seems to be the new Party boss. Which, together with a statement of the Congress that no explicitly *anti*-Communist merger will be tolerable to the Nenni Party, spells grave trouble for the incumbent Italian Government. If Nenni's left-wing Party, now managed by an extreme left-winger, lures Mr. Saragat's Social Democrats out of their coalition with the Christian Democrats, the present Government will topple with no legitimate successor in sight. And in the resulting period of protracted chaos, anything may happen in Italy.

● Soviet soldiers garrisoned in Hungary were so demoralized, two Hungarians told members of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, that, if the UN had sent in a token force of one hundred men, Hungary would be free today.

● The *New World Review*, a Communist publication manned by such stalwarts as Jessica Smith, Frederick V. Field and Eslanda Robeson, reports on a meeting in Communist China of a group of scientists gathered to pay tribute to—and to lay ideological claim upon—Benjamin Franklin. On first glance, we were glad to note that no American was present. But, of course, this proved too good to be true. Many Americans were there in spirit. It was to be expected that such old-hand fellow travelers as Dr. W.E.B. DuBois, Linus Pauling, Harlow Shapley, and Kirtley Mather would step forward. But how explain the greetings sent to the assembly by the Mayor of Philadelphia, the Executive Officer of the American Philosophical Society, the President of the University of Pennsylvania, the President of the Franklin Institute, the President of the National Academy of Sciences, the President of the Rockefeller Institute, and the managing editor of the *Saturday Evening Post*? Are we off on another binge of Communist fronting? (See Mr. Phelan's article on page 183.)

● Swiss sources report in detail, but without confirmation, that Chiang Kai-shek's son, Chiang Ching-kuo, is negotiating with representatives of the Chinese Communist regime over the future of Formosa. According to the rumor, Peiping has proposed to make Formosa an autonomous district within the "People's Republic." Chiang Kai-shek would be Governor of Formosa and also a vice-president of the People's Republic. Formosa would maintain its own defenses, but UN and other diplomatic representation would be transferred wholly to Peiping. But, judging by General Chiang Ching-kuo's outspoken denial, these reports have been planted by Communists as part of the campaign to weaken American support of Chiang.

A Policy on Israel

Israel's Prime Minister, Mr. Ben-Gurion, has allegedly told Mr. Eisenhower on the phone that he does not propose to lose the peace a few weeks after having won the war. (This, one notes in passing, is strictly an *American* habit.) Whether or not this argument impressed the President, Israel, it seems, is indeed not going to lose the peace.

For what the U.S. Administration has now offered the Israeli Government, in exchange for its willingness to withdraw Israeli troops from Egyptian territory, amounts to an acceptance of Israel's terms. Not only has the U.S. expressed its readiness to support the Israeli position in regard to Suez Canal shipping and the administration of the Gaza and Sinai territories; the U.S. Government seems also ready to guarantee Israel's frontiers.

Some such guarantee might indeed be inescapable —if it is part of a definitive and universal settlement in the Middle East. But if the U.S. were to underwrite the integrity of Israel, without reaching a friendly understanding with the surrounding Arab world at the same time, the Administration would be guilty of sacrificing America's primary strategic interests to Zionist pressures at home.

The Administration, in other words, should not make or withhold concessions in the Middle East simply to get a short relief on the cussed road of expediency. The Administration should plan and submit an intelligent solution in the Middle East.

We on NATIONAL REVIEW do not claim a special expertise on the unfathomably complex situation in the Middle East. But it seems to us that the U.S. is committed to these irreducible considerations of history,

human needs and plain fairness in that area: a) the Arabs must be fully compensated for the economic and social consequences of the Jewish conquest of Palestine; b) the Israelis must accept the borders drawn by the UN; c) these borders can be guaranteed only if, in return, the integrity of all Arab neighbors of Israel is just as effectively guaranteed. Furthermore, it seems to us, the U.S. ought to guarantee all these borders, not in bilateral agreements, but through the machinery of NATO.

The Israeli Government, to be sure, deserves to be congratulated on its hard-headed firmness in staring down the busybodies of the UN. It's good to note that not only Communist governments can safely tell Mr. Hammarskjold where to go. But our admiration for such repartee has limits. Mr. Dulles, in particular, must not be allowed to wipe out the budding American record of friendship with the Arab world merely to secure Israel's formal compliance with UN protocol and Mr. Eisenhower's tactical improvisations.

Inflation Demagogy

As the consumer price index hit a new high last week, Administration spokesmen sounded the alarm over the dangers of a growing inflation that may, Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey warned, bring in its wake "a depression that will curl your hair." The President himself called on business and labor to "exercise restraint" toward prices and wages. If not, he plainly threatened, the government may clamp down with controls.

NATIONAL REVIEW has no disagreement on the gravity of the inflationary danger. We were, indeed, insisting on it while the Administration was still boasting of the stability of "the Eisenhower dollar." But the President's new homily on the subject leaves us a bit cold. For this is the same Chief Executive who two weeks previously had submitted the largest peacetime budget in history—a budget with more inflationary potential than any other factor in the economy.

If the President thinks that "restraint" is in order, why doesn't he begin by restraining his budget? Why doesn't he cut out a few of the inflationary billions that he proposes to pour into roads, schools, power plants, subsidies and foreign aid? Why doesn't he abolish the devices through which the federal government lends money to various privileged groups at less than the market rate? Why, by government economy, doesn't he permit a lowering of taxes that would be automatically reflected in lower prices? If he wants labor to be "restrained," why does he continue New Deal policies that enable labor to lift its take continually, whether or not justified by an increase in productive efficiency? Why doesn't he stand behind Senator Byrd's proposal to squeeze five billion dollars out of his inflated demands for "fiscal 1958"?

Elmer Gantry-Nehru

Pakistan has recently appealed to the Security Council of the UN to send its newly-fledged international constabulary on from Sinai to Kashmir, to police the disbanding of Indian troops and the local Moslem militia, with a view to holding a plebiscite that was promised ages ago. The request has evoked the usual two-faced response from Nehru, who becomes more and more shameless as time goes by in his espousal of a double moral standard whenever the question of the plebiscite arises. Only last month a puppet "constituent assembly" in a section of Kashmir under Indian control voted to "accede" to India. Although the puppet assembly represents nothing more than a Hindu minority (Kashmir as a whole is Moslem), Nehru's chief delegate to the UN, Krishna Menon, had the effrontery to inform the Security Council that the phony "accession" is now a *fait accompli* which must be accepted as a legal substitute for the plebiscite which has never come off.

Thus Kashmir, if India gets away with it, follows Poland, Czechoslavakia and other nations which have voted "accession" to a master who has come in from

the outside and rigged the polls. It is too bad that the late Sinclair Lewis, creator of the hypocritical Reverend Elmer Gantry, isn't around to put Nehru into a novel about Gantryism on a global stage.

Not Hiding Nothing Nowhere

Others may be skeptical, but NATIONAL REVIEW, whose editors are all seasoned European travelers, understands: Dave Beck can't be expected to postpone a trip across the Atlantic just because a Senate committee is investigating labor racketeering.

"I have no objection to appearing before any committee," said Mr. Beck (in London), but "they can't expect me to interfere with my schedule. . . ." And NATIONAL REVIEW has a sybarite's respect for another sybarite's indulgences. It only wishes Mr. Beck hadn't compromised the cause of sybaritism by adding that he thinks a) unions should not oust members who seek protection from inquiry by taking the Fifth Amendment, b) unions should give a "reasonable" amount of cooperation (*i.e.*, not too much) to crime investigators, and c) while there "may be a few individuals in our union who have committed overt acts . . . this is a general social problem and it is not confined to unions."

Mr. Beck concludes that he has nothing to hide—"not a thing in the world." And, clearly, if a man has nothing to hide, he had just as well not hide it in London as in Washington.

The Bogey of Statistics

In a recent article in the *New York Times* Magazine Leon Keyserling trotted out a well-known statistical bogey man. Soviet Russia, he said, is increasing its industrial production at a rate several times as fast as that of the United States. Mr. Keyserling used this figure to justify a call for something even bigger than the Eisenhower budget. The same bogey is flaunted in a little book by Waddill Catchings called *Do Economists Understand Business?* to justify a return to low federal budgets and free enterprise.

As between Keyserling and Catchings, we need hardly say we are all for Catchings' prescription. But what interests us for the moment is the use made of comparative statistics by economists on both the Left and the Right. Almost invariably they stoop to making points by assuming that a 50 per cent increase from a figure of two is wonderful, while a 2 per cent increase from a figure of 50 is somehow beneath contempt. By extrapolating the Russian production curve it can easily be demonstrated that the U.S. will be hopelessly outpaced in a very short time. But you could do the same thing by starting out with the percentage increase of Liberian production in a good year. This is not to argue that Russian armaments are negligible. It is merely to say that the comparative use of percentages tells us much less than a direct comparison of planes, tanks, rifles, food supply and morale.

The Planned Botch

The idea that the strength of a nation depends on planning for more than military procurement has taken some hard jolts from recent events.

First of all, there was the British performance at Suez. Committed to a high degree of permanent state planning and control of the economy ever since the advent of the Labor Government, Britain (at least in the light of the theory) should have been able to bring sufficient strength to bear on the problem of strafing a few airfields and landing a few divisions from an offshore point. According to all the reports, however, an operation that would have been duck soup to Britons of a generation ago was way beyond the Britons of 1956. Organization was halting, transportation creaked, and energy from the pool of money, men and resources behind the military just wasn't there in sufficient quantities to be tapped in a hurry.

So much for the behavior of one "planned system" faced with a crisis. It might be argued that British weakness had nothing to do with questions of a controlled economy *per se;* that the fiasco at Suez merely highlighted a decay that had begun even before the nineteenth century ran out. But if the British experience is inconclusive, the experience of Russia, which has been "planning" for two generations, should provide real support for the theory. Alas for the planners, however, it does nothing of the sort.

Mr. Joseph Alsop, spending a few days in Moscow, reports real evidence of weakness in the Soviet economy. Though he notes that the Soviet Union seems to be a "high technical society," that its industrial production has passed "the combined production of the two originators of the industrial revolution, Britain and Germany," Mr. Alsop goes on to say that the system is "too complex, too massive, too delicate in its interrelationships . . . to be successfully managed with the knout alone."

It is perfectly true that Khrushchev and Company have denounced the methods of Stalinism (*i.e.*, use of the knout). But what stands out in the Alsop report is that they don't know how to employ any other method to make their system work. Mr. Alsop failed to draw the only possible conclusion from his evidence—that Russia would find it difficult to sus-

tain its military forces in operations even a middling distance from home.

As if to buttress Mr. Alsop's piece, Otto Grotewohl, the Communist Fuehrer of East Germany, chose the same day to hint that the Soviet Union is laboring under a severe strain in its attempt to overcome setbacks caused by events in Poland and in Hungary. The need to give Eastern Europe several hundred million dollars of additional economic aid to counter continuing unrest has forced the Soviet to cut back on its capital investment program. In other words, the "planned" Russian system just hasn't stored up fat for an emergency, either.

But it is, of course, a system's resiliency in an unforeseen crisis that is the measure of its "effectiveness." And, in all demonstrable experience, "planned" economy has each time proved to be, among other things, a complete botch.

NATIONAL TRENDS

L. BRENT BOZELL

Privileges and Elections

Senators Curtis (R., Nebr.) and Goldwater (R., Ariz.) had a fling last week at the Senate Election Subcommittee's report on 1956 campaign contributions. The subcommittee's figures—over $20 million spent by the Republicans, against roughly $11 million by the Democrats—they contended, gave a grotesquely distorted picture of what really happened.

There was, for one thing, the matter of the funds raised and spent by independent groups such as the Committee for an Effective Congress and Americans for Democratic Action. The expenditures by these groups were listed, all right, but were not included in the Democratic total although practically all of such funds were spent on behalf of Democratic candidates.

The Senators' main charge, however, had to do with Labor's role in the campaign. The subcommittee's figures, Curtis said, ignored the "major item in the Democratic expenditures by the unions." Curtis' point here was twofold. Labor's acknowledged expenditures of $941,271 had been listed separately by the subcommittee— but why? Since the lion's share of that amount was spent for Democratic candidates, just comparison of the parties' expenditures surely required that Labor's figure be broken down and included in the party totals. But that was a relatively minor matter. What really disturbed him was the $941,271 figure itself: "that figure [purportedly representing the total amount] spent by labor throughout the United States . . . is so shockingly low that it should be a challenge to everyone."

Senator Curtis proceeded to list a few reasons why it was a challenge to him. "I inquired of the staff of the subcommittee," he informed his colleagues, "as to how much of that figure was allocated to Michigan, that great industrial state, and I received the reply that $79,939 was spent by Labor in the state of Michigan in the last campaign. [In that connection] I desire to call attention to a story written by Asher Lauren in the Detroit *News* of October 7, in which he reports that $1.20 a year was assessed against the 700,000 Michigan union members as citizenship funds [*sic*], and made available for political activities, in addition to the funds raised by voluntary contributions. That," the Senator remarked, "might be more like the fact. If it were only 10 cents a month, it would be one million, not 79,000 dollars."

Then there was the case of Local 599, UAW, at Flint, Michigan, which the subcommittee's staff had investigated at Senator Curtis' request. The staff found that the Greater Flint Industrial Union Council had requested its locals, including 599, to assess their members 47½ cents each as a political contribution to the election, and also to call out their political action committees for work during the campaign. The Council recommended, moreover, that any union member called out of the shop for electioneering purposes should be reimbursed out of union funds.

Local 599, according to its own minutes, complied with the request. The direct assessment in this one local alone had amounted to $25,000. What is more, Local 599 hired 100 political workers for the three days prior to the election, and provided that each worker be paid $20 a day, and $5 for expenses.

The subcommittee referred the case of Local 599 to the Justice Department, pleading insufficient evidence to determine whether the law had been violated. But Senator Curtis' point was that whether or not a violation of the law was involved, a political expenditure certainly was; yet the subcommittee had neglected to include the outlay in its tabulations.

Senator Goldwater, for his part, conceded that such flagrant abuses of union leaders' power was largely a thing of the past. There was evidence, he said, to show that most unions "have stopped direct contributions from the general fund." But if the methods are

now more devious, they are not necessarily less effective.

Goldwater cited the AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education as a means of tapping union members for "educational" funds, which the union leaders then proceed to spend on material that is highly relevant, to say the least, to political campaigns. One such "educational" project is the distribution of "voting records" in which the Senators and Representatives are listed, simply, as voting "R" (right) or "W" (wrong) on the major issues. A large portion of "educational" funds are used to pay for union-sponsored radio and television broadcasts, to say nothing of union newspapers which make no bones about slanting political news. Goldwater and Curtis found it especially curious that, though the subcommittee had made a point of noting that funds spent for radio and television had favored the Republicans in the ratio of 4 to 2.9, it had not included in the Democratic totals the notoriously unsubtle Democratic propaganda disseminated nightly during the campaign by Mr. Guy Nunn, the union mouthpiece operating out of Wayne County, Michigan.

There was also the matter of money spent from "lay-off" or "lost-time reimbursement" funds. Goldwater cited evidence that many unions make a practice of paying temporarily laid-off workers out of such funds to do political chores for the Democratic Party.

Finally, the question of manpower contribution: The "practical politician," Goldwater said, "does not care particularly whether a donation is made to him of $1,000 or whether he received a thousand dollars worth of manpower help in the course of an election . . . [e.g.] on election day [union] people are available to make hundreds of thousands of telephone calls, and to drive cars that are supplied with gasoline." On this point, Goldwater cited a recent squib from *Business Week*:

> Labor is concentrating on getting out the vote. As in most other industrial centers, it will have car pools, baby sitters and telephone reminder squads working on the outside. Just for Democrats? "Oh, no," a Toledo United Labor Committee spokesman said. "We will pick anyone up on election day—Democrats, Independents, non-partisans, everybody except Republicans."

Isn't it possible, Goldwater was saying, to put some valuation, however rough, on such "contributions" and include them in the Democratic totals?

But all that talk about who really spent the most during the campaign was frightfully unimportant, even a quibble, in terms of the larger problem Curtis and Goldwater were addressing themselves to. "I have always maintained," Senator Goldwater said, "that there is a moral issue involved, as to whether or not it is morally correct to take the money of a Republican, in the form of compulsory dues, and spend it for a Democrat, especially when the Republican will go to the polls and vote against the Democratic candidate, and the philosophies he represents . . ." If not a "moral" issue, it is certainly one that strikes deep at the philosophical axioms of American politics. Goldwater's equation is inescapable: compulsory unionism+union political activity= an infringement of the individual's political franchise.

What to do about it? Most conservative guns are trained on the compulsory unionism factor; but I query whether, for these purposes, the target is well chosen. Is the above equation really damaged if you delete "compulsory"? That is to say: once you have done away with the closed shop and the union shop, you have yet to contend with the economic and social pressures that will unquestionably impel millions of urban voters to join unions, notwithstanding and, in many cases, in spite of their political preferences. As against these pressures, a Republican worker's political instincts are, as a practical matter, inoperative; he will readily join an organization whose political activities he may hotly disapprove, and over which he has no effective control, not even a vote on political issues as such.

The remedy, perhaps, is to outlaw all varieties of union political activity. And, though the need for it is less compelling, the bar could profitably be enforced in the case of corporations as well.

What is the rationale for State intervention in this matter? Very simply that the economic power, in virtue of which unions attract members, was bestowed in large measure by the State—notably when Congress passed the Wagner Act; and what the State hath given, the State may take away. And *should* take away in the areas in which that power has been abused. Mandatory collective bargaining was originally justified (and, let us add, is still justifiable) by the need to balance the economic power of employee and employer; it was not, nor can it be reasonably now, justified as a means of increasing the *political* power of employees—especially when it is really the power of union leaders that is increased, leaders who are presumably selected for reasons other than their ability to diagnose national political issues.

In short, the legal concept of *ultra vires* should be applied to union political activities. By the same reasoning, it should be applied to corporations which have been chartered by the states for certain business purposes, when corporations make use of their organizational power, directly or indirectly, to influence political campaigns. There is no reason why the election process—spending and propagandizing as well as voting—should not be restricted to individuals and to private organizations formed for that specific purpose.

Neutralization: Liberal Assumptions

Mr. Buckley enters the discussion of the Burnham proposals, which he finds risky in the light of the West's reluctance to increase its exposure

WM. F. BUCKLEY, JR.

In the past several weeks we have seen a spirited discussion of the proposals advanced by James Burnham several weeks ago. NATIONAL REVIEW set out to sponsor a discussion between "men who share the relevant fundamental assumptions" as to the nature and designs of the enemy. The discussion was to have been, exclusively, a debate on strategy. It did not turn out to be just that. Certain things—one thing especially—that Mr. Burnham said prompted the critics of his proposals to ask whether the Burnham Plan did not in effect call for submission to unacceptable general assumptions. Thus the debate grew more interesting, and more complex—and more serious.

A great deal rests on the military generalizations advanced by the various parties to the discussion. They differ so widely as to have made intercommunication very difficult, and to have led persons of identical strategic concern to belligerently dissimilar positions. Ralph de Toledano, for instance, whiffs the Burnham Plan and laughs it away. Why? Because "Khrushchev, Bulganin and Co. would sooner elect Mr. Burnham and Mr. Buckley to the Central Committee of the CPUSSR than they would withdraw from Central Europe. Therefore the debate makes no sense." Mr. William Schlamm, on the other hand, shows apocalyptical apprehension lest the Communists actually be given the opportunity to act on the Burnham proposals. Far from tossing them aside, the Communists would eat them up—". . . the Communists can safely accept the suggested stratagem. It would give them Europe."

Factual disagreements continue. Mr. Schlamm, for instance, believes that the army of NATO, combined with the emergent army of West Germany, constitute a significant military deterrent against a Soviet blitzkrieg. Gerhart Niemeyer believes that the NATO army—reduced to a mere fifteen effective divisions—is not now and will not be in the foreseeable future an effective deterrent. He does not, in short, believe that in the direct military sense, the West has a great deal to lose by giving up NATO forces in West Germany.

Add to this a number of other differing estimates. How hard is the Soviet Union finding it to keep order in the satellite world? Very hard indeed, Mr. Burnham deduces. Nothing they can't handle with one hand behind their back, Mr. Bozell says. However hard pressed they are, says Mr. Meyer, to proceed on any assumption of Soviet weakness or inability to remain in total control of the satellites is folly. To what extent is Gomulka a serious threat to Soviet —or, more important, Communist— hegemony? Gomulka is a variant without precedent in Communist history; Gomulka is more likely than not controlled by, rather than in control of, the elemental forces at large in Poland—so thinks Mr. Burnham. Mr. Schlamm takes issue: Gomulka's quarrel with the Kremlin is of the old-fashioned, factional kind. He and Tito and Nagy are Communist factionalists, capable of exasperating the Kremlin, yes, but capable of deflecting world revolution, no. They may gnaw at the side of the Soviet Union, but the Communist whale moves forward unperturbed, and the parasites that adhere to its body are glad to move with it. As dissenters from Kremlin policy the voices of the factionalists are being magnified beyond their importance. Listen to them at your peril. They are, when all is said and done, the voices of Communists, not of anti-Communists. Do not depend upon them to cross the only line that is crucial, the line that separates the revolutionist from the conservative. Tito never crossed that line and never will. Neither will the others. They are the enemy. . . .

Time and Tide

These and other questions are important, and we should all endeavor to take the correct position with respect to them as time goes by. But surely we must resist the temptation to order our thinking on fixed conclusions of the kind that time and tide are capable of undermining—such as the one that sees West Germany maintaining massive armed forces that, somehow, never seem to materialize. It is a mistake to seek to impose *a priori* generalizations on recalcitrant data. It may be true—it is true, as far as I can see—that Tito is first a Communist and only avocationally an anti-Kremlin factionalist; but that does not mean that the *genus* is biologically incapable of producing the man who elects to resist the march of International Communism rather than submit to the discipline of the Kremlin. Though the Communist deviationist is to be reckoned more importantly Communist than deviationist, we should not as a matter of dogma exclude the possibility that events might bring him to be, in strategic terms, rather a net loss than a net gain to the International Communist movement. What of the German army? Well, it does not look at this moment as though it will grow mighty. But perhaps it will, and there is no reason to adopt a position that absolutely posits one thing or the other.

What matters is the assiduous and intelligent cultivation of the anti-Communist potential everywhere in the world. In every situation we must move toward inducing a net deterioration in the immediate and long-range position of the Soviet Union. To effect that, our lines (not our position) must be flexibly drawn. That means that

we must not postulate, for example, either that West Germany will create an army sufficient to withstand the forces of Russia, or that anti-Stalinist factionalists will necessarily prove, at the margin, as loyal to Moscow as Tito has proved to be.

These questions, then, can be left in abeyance, pending the developing data. But other questions that have been raised cannot.

The Challenged Assumptions

The provocative statement of James Burnham is that the assumptions of the Eisenhower Administration must be adjudged a part of the reality of our time, and hence axiomatic in discussions of foreign policy of the kind in which he was engaging. So long as the assumptions remain unchanged, Mr. Burnham says, they must be deferred to in any viable policy recommendation advanced by Western anti-Communists. The assumptions are there, as real, as palpable as a Soviet division, and like the Soviet division, they must figure in any sublunary discussion of strategy.

That proposition Messrs. Schlamm, Meyer and Bozell oppose on highly arresting grounds. The Eisenhower-Liberal assumptions to which Mr. Burnham refers are, they say, suicidal —therefore *any* strategic planning that defers to them will be suicidal. Our time is fruitfully spent only in challenging those assumptions. The penalty for failure to displace them is national death.

If this is true, one wonders why the proposal that the West move from its present position on Germany—a position which, having been arrived at by our leaders, conforms with the objectionable assumptions—to a new position on Germany—explicitly advanced as lying within the assumptions—has called forth such heated opposition? If the Eisenhower-Liberal assumptions are in command of the situation (and does anyone doubt *that*?) and if those assumptions lead ineluctably to disaster, then the difference between alternative policies both of which conform with the assumptions is academic. One wonders why some of Mr. Burnham's critics are so very much animated by a discussion as to which is the better—or the worse—road to Hell.

There is a sense in which the rejection of the Burnham proposals implies the rejection of them in favor of the status quo, and therefore the approval—or, more precisely, the relative approval—of the status quo. To say that adoption of the Burnham Plan would be disastrous is to say—in context—that to continue on our present course is substantively preferable. But how can it be substantively preferable if, conforming as our foreign policy does with the Eisenhower assumptions, it will necessarily lead to disaster? It would seem to me that the critics of the Burnham Plan should reject it a) with academic moderation—as a series of proposals that call—in context of the certitude of ultimate disaster—merely for a net deterioration of the Western position; or b) as a Plan that calls for basing our foreign policy on a fresh set of assumptions which, *unlike those they replace,* are disastrous.

It is my view that, as it is set forth, the Burnham Plan should be rejected on tactical grounds.

In saying so, let me say that I do not take position a) above.

In my opinion, the Eisenhower-Liberal assumption which we are discussing is not intrinsically suicidal, and I wonder why it is so frequently misjudged. Eisenhower and his schoolmen are notoriously imprecise verbalizers, and if you add to that the difficulty that results from the indistinctness of the thoughts they set out to verbalize, confusion is understandable. Now all of us know about this confusion and have written about it; and yet time after time we find ourselves probing some of Eisenhower's clichés as though they had been formulated with algebraic exactitude. "War is unthinkable" is a phrase Eisenhower will drop at the whish of a spitball—but does it follow that Eisenhower moves on the assumption that war *is* unthinkable? That the circumstances are unimaginable in which we would go to war? When he goes on and on about peace at any price or about how force is an illegitimate instrument of national policy, does he *mean* he wants peace at any price, or that he would *never* resort to force?

Surely the answer is no. Eisenhower—and, I think, the overwhelming majority of his advisers—would sooner fight the Soviet Union than surrender to the Soviet Union. These men may be drugged, immobilized, enchanted, but they would not willingly exchange freedom-and-war for subjugation-and-peace. They are corrupt and ineffectual; but they are not treasonable, or pacifist in the doctrinaire sense, or men totally neutralized of civilized instinct.

The danger lies in the fact that as executors of a policy based on an entirely acceptable assumption, our leaders will nevertheless lead the free world to disaster. They will do so because of a seemingly invincible ignorance as to the intentions and resources of the enemy and a dangerous underestimation of the extrinsic value to the West of the freedom of other peoples. War is not unthinkable to Dwight Eisenhower. He would go to war tomorrow to resist the occupation of Long Island by a foreign power. He would go to war, in point of fact, to resist the occupation of Bermuda; and England and France, even. And West Germany? *And East Germany?*

The challenge, as I see it, is not so much to persuade the Liberals to replace this particular assumption, for it is entirely serviceable. The challenge is to persuade them fully to understand that assumption and to be guided by it in their day-to-day dealings with the enemy. The same men who would instinctively go to war to defend the Virgin Islands think nothing of consigning the peoples of the satellite world to perpetual slavery—for they are incapable of understanding in a Pole or a Hungarian feelings with respect to the integrity of their nations identical to those we feel with respect to our own. Our reluctance to assert our assumptions in geographically distant situations breeds paralysis, and retreat follows. For several years the retreat went forward at breakneck pace. It has slowed down. To a stop? Are Quemoy and Matsu certainly ours? Is Vietnam? Austria? The Mideast?

Can the free world be persuaded, *mutatis mutandis,* to extend eastward the line that marks the effective boundary this side of which the West is prepared to act upon its preference for freedom over slavery? That is the serious question raised by Mr. Burnham's proposals, and the one with respect to which Mr. Bozell cor-

(*Continued on p.* 190)

Letter from London

ANTHONY LEJEUNE

Mr. Macmillan's Flying Start

"Every battle of the warrior," says Isaiah, "is with confused noise and garments rolled in blood." Only a few weeks ago this would have been a fair description of the British political scene. The House of Commons became a bear-garden. Orders papers were waved, insults hurled back and forth, Ministers shouted down. But now suddenly all is sweet reason.

Just why Mr. Macmillan's arrival should have had this soothing effect is hard to say. He hasn't *done* anything yet, except choose a new Cabinet, the most surprising thing about which is that it should contain so few surprises. He has made speeches, of course. These admittedly seemed to strike a satisfactory note of firmness but their actual content held little beyond well-turned platitudes.

The fact remains that for the first time in well over a year there is a quite perceptible mood of optimism. The pound has strengthened, share values have gone up. People feel that a ship which was drifting has now acquired a pilot. They hope in particular for a budget which will lift some of the crushing burden of the free world's heaviest taxation. If Macmillan proves a disappointment, there could be a dangerous reaction. But if he can live up to the hopes which are being pinned on him, the Conservative Party may well recover all that surge of popularity which swept it back into power in 1955 and has since been lost with such startling rapidity.

The problems which the new Government has to face are clear enough. The most obvious need is a restoration of something like harmony between Britain and America. The difficulties are well enough known but just because they are so well known, and because so many people on both sides of the Atlantic agree that they must be overcome, this may not be as serious a problem as it might appear. From a long-term point of view, there are two other problems whose roots go much deeper. The first is the future of the United Nations. This, of course, must be exercising responsible statesmen everywhere. As long as the UN remains an arena for conflicting power blocs, situations are always apt to arise in which just and necessary actions have to be taken without, and perhaps even contrary to, a decision of the UN.

The other problem belongs more intimately to Britain. The time seems to be approaching when the whole nature of the Commonwealth may have to be re-examined. During one recent week alone, there were three significant incidents. Mr. Bandaranaike, the Prime Minister of Ceylon, said that nationalization of all tea plantations, most of which are owned by Britons, would have to come. South Africa took steps toward doing away with the Union Jack. India profoundly shocked many people by her attitude toward Kashmir. No wonder there's been a good deal of talk about closing the ranks of the Commonwealth, forming an inner ring from which these doubtful members could be excluded.

Now that the heat is at least temporarily off in the Middle East, Mr. Macmillan may find home politics even more absorbing. Here, too, his chief task is to restore confidence. The prestige of Parliament has never been lower. The Tonbridge and Melton by-elections showed, not so much that the Convervatives have become unpopular, as that a great many people who normally vote Conservative have come to feel that it isn't worth while to vote at all.

This is largely an economic matter. The middle classes have been squeezed too long and too relentlessly. Super-tax, for instance, still begins at £2000 a year, a figure which was fixed at a time when £2000 was worth approximately three times what it is today. Inflation has swallowed up such small tax relief as has been given since the war. No matter which party is nominally in power, so long as inflation proceeds and taxes continue to be steeply progressive, a policy of equalization must prevail.

This is not only depressing for individuals but seriously damaging to industry. Mr. Macmillan knows it and will certainly try to lighten the burden. But the whole expensive apparatus of the Welfare State ("trying," as someone said, "to create a Marketing Board for the milk of human kindness") is still virtually sacrosanct; so, if government expenditure is to be cut, the only obvious targets are details of administration and defense. Hence Mr. Sandys' trip to Washington.

The late Sir Waldron Smithers once asked a famous question in Parliament: "Is the Minister aware that Moses ruled Israel with only Ten Commandments while you've got no fewer than 25,400 controls?" Everyone thought it very funny at the time, but it's really no laughing matter. In a single day's newspapers I counted five published accounts of what our fathers would have considered gross interferences with the liberty of the individual: cases of compulsory purchase, planning permission refused to someone who wanted to build, petty regulations on how you may or may not do some quite ordinary act.

Each one of these problems holds explosives, but at the moment Mr. Macmillan has no intention of putting a match to any of them. Before he became a politician, he was a successful businessman. His brisk air of getting on with the day's business is infectious. Even the Labor Party has dropped its silly clamor about the way in which the Prime Minister was chosen and seems willing to concentrate on current issues.

There is no apparent reason why everyone should be smiling at Mr. Macmillan as though he were a beautiful new-born baby. But neither was there any apparent reason why Sir Anthony Eden should have had such a rough passage from the very start of his career at 10 Downing Street. These things cannot be assessed wholly in terms of calculations and prospects. It remains true that Mr. Macmillan has brought with him a new atmosphere of hope; and that fact is in itself some slight reason to believe that the hope may not be in vain.

from WASHINGTON *straight*

A NEWSLETTER

SAM M. JONES

Round Two: The Hornet's Nest

The Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy has run smack into opposition by the strangest company of political bedfellows since Senators Reed, Borah and Lodge (the elder) wrecked Wilson's scheme for American participation in the League of Nations.

On the Democratic side are Senators Fulbright, O'Mahoney, Morse, Humphrey and Long, who no longer believe that Mr. Eisenhower is sacrosanct and that Dulles is his disciple. Morse, for example, says the Secretary of State is completely incompetent and an unmitigated liar. Long called Mr. Dulles the most evasive witness in his experience with recalcitrants. O'Mahoney denied Senator Capehart's charge that he (O'Mahoney) had stated that the President cannot read the English language, but he pulled no punches on the "Eisenhower Doctrine," which he denounced as a lever to "break down the system of checks and balances which the framers of the Constitution believed to be the bulwark of government by the people."

Among the Republicans who fail to see eye to eye with the President are Senators Bridges and Knowland. The point can be made that they never did; that they constitute the Old Guard, the Taft Republicans. But also included among Mr. Eisenhower's (and Dulles') critics are Saltonstall, Javits and Kuchel, prominent representatives of the New Republicanism. This reporter believes Mr. Eisenhower will compromise; there will be no sanctions invoked against Israel; the "Eisenhower Doctrine" will be diluted with amendments; Dulles, health permitting, will carry on, but the White House has kicked the hornet's nest. This round goes to Capitol Hill.

The Age of Miracles

This story may be apocryphal but old-timers swear it happened. When Johnstown, Pennsylvania, was inundated in the great flood, one of the state's largest newspapers sent its star reporter to cover the disaster. There was a long wait. The city editor damned everybody and everything, including his vocation, and held the front page open. Finally the copy began to arrive by telegraph. The lead went something like this: "Tonight God stood on the mountains, surveyed the ruins of Johnstown and wept." To which the editor filed this reply: "Get interview with God, pictures if possible, and come in."

That reporter was ahead of his time. He was living in the drab era when reporters were expected to abide by the immutables of "who, where, when, how and why." Miracles were suspect, even when accompanied by affidavits. It is scarcely necessary to remark that times have changed. Most of our contemporary journalists never let facts disturb their opinions, and you can borrow on miracles without co-signers.

We have just had a miracle here. It is attested by Carl F. Hansen, assistant superintendent of schools, as faithfully reported in the *Washington Post* under the byline of Eve Edstrom. Mr. Hansen describes the "miracle of social adjustment" (under school integration) as "a step toward the maximum development of every pupil, regardless of race, creed and economic status and supposed capacity for learning."

The Hansen pamphlet, written before the Davis Subcommittee report, was sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith. It does not challenge or refute the findings of the subcommittee; it just denounces them as "one-sided, negative and biased." It does not dispute the evidence of increased truancy, theft, vandalism and sex offenses in integrated schools. Nor does it offer evidence in contradiction of sworn testimony that the norm of academic achievement has been steadily dropping since integration; that teachers have been intimidated to the point of resigning; that belligerency and molestation are more common than the three R's; that there is a steadily growing migration of white families with school-age children out of the District of Columbia into Maryland and Virginia. Nor does Mr. Hansen mention the material increase in pregnancies and illegitimate births among high school girls.

The Washington school situation is not good, to put it mildly. Maybe Mr. Hansen, in collaboration with the *Washington Post*, can get an interview with God, *and pictures*. Until then, we note for the record that the blessed "man-made miracle" can be discerned only with the aid of opaque rose-colored glasses.

Adieu to All That?

Sixteen gray gun horses and a black stallion will be turned out to grass, or into dog food, if Congress approves the economy item in the Defense Department's $38 million budget. The horses have been kept at Fort Meyer, Virginia, for use in military funerals at Arlington National Cemetery. The Defense Department accountants say it will save $77.90 per funeral if the horses are replaced by motor hearses. No more empty boots reversed in the stirrups; no black stallion; no empty saddle; no flag-draped caisson drawn by gray gun horses. What's tradition worth if we can save almost $80 on the transportation of our honored dead to "Fame's Eternal Camping Ground"?

There is considerable bitterness in Congress and elsewhere. Many people seem to feel that, if we can afford billions in foreign aid, we can afford the upkeep of seventeen horses—and respect for our military dead. The "climate"—as Madison Avenue would put it—of the Pentagon is non-sentimental. But public opinion is still a force. If you think this is a worthwhile economy, write a letter of congratulation to Charley Wilson. If you think it is a desecration, write to your Congressman and Senators. They can spare the horses.

Chicago: The Opposition Speaks

An observer of the recent meeting arranged by the Abraham Lincoln Republican Club finds opposition to the Liberal Establishment firm but precarious

REVILO OLIVER

In Chicago on February 9 a thousand people paid five dollars each to hear speeches by four members of the dwindling minority of men in public life who dare to oppose the Liberal Establishment.

The very names of the speakers sufficed to remind the audience how precarious is the position of conservatives in this country. Two, former Senator Welker of Idaho and former Governor J. Bracken Lee of Utah, were removed from public office in 1956 when the Janissaries of the New Order moved into their states with the usual equipment of smear-pots and money bags. The Establishment will surely mobilize all its forces of propaganda and corruption to defeat Senator McCarthy in 1958.

And even while Senator Jenner spoke in Chicago, two members of the Republican Committee in Indiana resigned, reportedly in protest because he "is not on Ike's team." Republicans from Indiana tell me that their state organization is in an advanced state of fission produced largely by pressure from Washington.

The Abraham Lincoln Republican Club, which arranged the meeting in Chicago, is a conservative group whose only connection with the Republican Party lies in the fact that its members belong to that party and are urged to become politically active in it and thus influence its policies. The Club hopes to establish branches in all congressional districts and thus eventually to recapture the Republican Party for conservatism.

Its leader, Mr. Edgar C. Bundy, is undoubtedly right in declaring that statements of principle are ineffectual without candidates, and that conservatives can elect candidates only by working from the precinct level. And he may well be right in his contention that the Republican Party can be liberated from its Babylonian Captivity. But when from the platform he impugned the motives of unnamed but recognizable advocates of a new party, he gave offense to some members of his audience.

Former Senator Welker discoursed eloquently on the present plight of the yet unpurged conservatives in Congress, and described the methods which were so successfully used against him in 1956. He gave the principal credit for his defeat to an adroit "hatchet-job" published in *Collier's* "at just the right time," and to the controlled newspapers in his own state which spread defamatory lies to which he had no means of replying effectively since he did not have a newspaper of his own.

Leftward under Eisenhower

Former Governor Lee spoke with such direct and unquestionable sincerity that many in the audience found his speech the most moving of the four. He described with wry humor the consternation of the Republican organizations in his own state in 1955 when, from the same platform in Chicago, he pointed out that the first two years of the Eisenhower regime had driven the country farther to the left than any preceding Administration. He reminded his audience that Eisenhower, like Roosevelt, was elected under false pretenses, and questioned the validity of "mandates" obtained by deceit.

Senator Jenner expounded how, since 1932, the American government has been transformed into "a new Leviathan" so pervasive in its powers and so secret in its operations that it is "almost invisible to Congress." It is naive to accuse this government of blunders in foreign policy or waste in its dissipation of national wealth. On the contrary, this government is clear-sighted and terribly efficient. Our "foreign policy is perfectly tailored to serve its interests," and of its vast expenditures "no money is wasted; every dollar is spent to buy political support." The Leviathan has created an ubiquitous propaganda machine whose conveyor-belts are organizations such as women's clubs, churches, schools and colleges. It has repeatedly demonstrated its ability to "brainwash the constituents" of senators and congressmen, and has defeated or cowed many of its opponents. But there remains one power that can be invoked by Americans not reconciled to servitude—"the little congressional district back home."

Senator McCarthy, who spoke with his wonted fire (I suspect that he revised his script while speaking and abandoned it near the conclusion), gave an analysis of the much touted "Atoms for Peace" plan which is now pending before Congress. The details and implications of this treaty have been concealed by the press, and, in the Senator's opinion, there is a danger—even a probability—that, when it comes to a vote, "the majority of the Senate will roll over and play dead." Under this treaty the United States will supply to an international agency, over which it will have no control, enough Uranium 235 to produce at once 550 atomic bombs—and 2,200 bombs by 1960. The beneficiaries are to be, among others, Russia, her various satellites, and India. Although Soviet China is not now on the list, the international agency is so designed as to make her inclusion a matter of course. The consequences of this measure are obvious, and Senator McCarthy asked his audience, "How insane can we get?"

Could this analysis be the long-awaited shock that will awaken Americans from their sleep-walking? It certainly will not disturb the Liberals. The fatuous will reason that social justice requires us to equip India with atomic bombs so that, should some future American govern-

ment fail to provide for the nurture and comfort of Mr. Nehru's prolific mobs, he can collect the tribute which it is our obvious duty to pay him. The "realistic" will remember that they owe their power to the celerity with which Russia was provided with atomic weapons after the war, and calculate how much greater will be their power over cowards whom they can terrify by the claim that any international bandit might, if vexed, destroy at least New York. But what of the sleep-walkers?

The answer was perhaps provided by the two Chicago newspapers which appeared most sympathetic to the purposes of the meeting. To the entire program, including Senator McCarthy's analysis of a treaty that could effectively reduce the United States to international bondage, these papers devoted respectively 29.5 inches (on page 3) and 13 inches (beginning on page 1). The same papers devoted, respectively, 43.5 and 87 inches to informing their readers that there was no news about a murder that had already provided twenty days of titillation for the public.

Less Employment Predicted

And what of the Abraham Lincoln Republican Club's paying guests? They were an audience that it was difficult to appraise. The schedule was so arranged that there were no intermissions in which people might gather in the halls for informal conversation. What one man could see and learn was limited indeed.

Several of the men to whom I spoke expressed concern over a matter that had not been mentioned on the platform—the present state of the national economy. A professional statistician gave me figures. Installment purchases have produced a current indebtedness of $41 billion, stretching consumer credit to a thin membrane that will be ruptured by even a small decline in employment. Inventories have now reached $87 billion, and no manufacturer can or will long employ men to increase the quantities of unsold goods in his warehouses. Employment, therefore, will drop sharply in coming months.

Four men alluded to the President's amazing declaration to the effect that if "Capital" and "Labor" did not prevent inflation, the Great White Father would have to discipline his erring children by putting them in economic straitjackets and incidentally decreeing "the end of the America we know." All agreed that the statement was both arrogant, since it came from a President, and fantastic, since it came from the proponent of the most inflationary budget in our history. But the group was split between confidence that Americans would not tolerate price-controls and rationing in a time of peace; and a fear that the Liberals would welcome an economic collapse as a means of completing the job they have so well begun. A fifth man differed even more: Eisenhower, too, will eventually find that there is only one economic painkiller—war.

Docility on the Campus

The most clearly definable element in the meeting, and in some respects the most interesting, was composed of students from seventeen Midwestern colleges and universities. It may be a coincidence, but only the students from a comparatively expensive college seemed inclined to identify conservatism with support of Eisenhower.

The other groups were unanimous on the essentials. Conservatives are a small minority on each campus. And so are the really active Liberals, although they are somewhat more numerous and much more vociferous. The great majority of students fundamentally "just don't give a damn." Their horizon extends from the class in the morning to the "date" in the evening. On all the campuses one finds an amazing mental docility. Large numbers of students form their opinions by saying "All the political scientists are Liberals; they must know what is what."

The focus of the Liberal infection was variously identified. Some felt that the professors of "education" really succeed in indoctrinating their captive audiences with the gospel of the proletarian revolution. Others felt that the intellectual nullity of these shamans was so apparent that they had little influence.

The representatives of two institutions felt that the really effective propaganda was put forth in courses in anthropology and history. American history, which naive conservatives used to regard as a kind of prophylaxis against Communism, is sometimes converted into a demonstration of the iniquity of the reactionaries who framed the Constitution, and of the folly of the "unsophisticated" who try to resist the "wave of the future." More subtly insidious is the class in ancient history in which, with appropriate analogies, Cicero is depicted as a dishonest old fuddy-duddy who wanted to preserve the Roman constitution and social injustice, while Caesar is portrayed as the clear-sighted progressive who saw that constitutions are just superstitions that stand in the way of social gains. The student is presumably able to draw his own conclusions.

The grimmest words that I heard came from an Hungarian who came to the meeting as an observer. He was a boy of fifteen when the Austro-Hungarian Empire disintegrated. He lived through the Communistic terrorism of Bela Kun. He saw the Communists at work a second time after the recent war, when an American military victory in Europe again brought the murderous reformers to power in his country. He reached the United States in 1952, and has since that time watched our political development with anxiety.

It corresponds, he says, point by point to the developments which preceded the Communist take-overs in Hungary. He takes no stock in hypotheses about "American idealism" or a "spontaneous trend toward centralized government." That there are many unwitting and witless tools, he grants; but he sees only the familiar climate of a public opinion manufactured by plotters. The directive force in American politics, he thinks, is "one hundred per cent conspiracy," and he sees before us and himself a road that leads only to the gates of the concentration camp.

The thousand men and women who attended the meeting applauded the speakers who called for "a great uprising in this country." They may have gone home with a fixed determination to go to work in their own precincts. But I felt no vibration of enthusiasm or common purpose. The great uprising may yet take place, and the Abraham Lincoln Club's Seminar may be a prodrome of it. But I could not say to myself, "This is It."

Rebirth of the Popular Front?

The author, a vice president of the St. Louis Union Trust Company, and a student of Leftist behavior, predicts a revival of Popular Front schemes

TOWNER PHELAN

Perhaps the greatest threat to the free world today lies less in the military might of the Soviet Union than in the danger of a revival of the Popular Front tactics of the thirties. In fact, such a revival had made great progress before the Hungarian revolt put it temporarily in cold storage.

What the Soviet Union won during the War and in the immediate postwar years was due in large measure to the blindly pro-Communist attitude of the Western World nurtured during the Popular Front era. It will always be debatable to what extent our childish belief in the good faith and good intentions of the Soviet Union was responsible for the series of fateful decisions by which we lost the war in the political sense and built up the power of the Soviet Union.

The decision not to invade the Balkans as Churchill advocated; the decision to abandon Poland; the decision to let the Russians take Berlin despite Montgomery's urging that we get there first; the decision to halt Patton so that the Red Army could "liberate" Czechoslovakia; the decision to pull our troops back from the parts of Saxony they had occupied in the closing days of the war in Europe; the decision to switch our support from Mikhailovitch to Tito and force a coalition between Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese Communists; these were among the fateful decisions that made the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communists the only victors in World War II.

How deeply the Liberals were emotionally involved in Communism and how greatly this involvement influenced American history is little realized.

The best evidence of the extent to which Liberals were implicated in Communism comes from their own mouths. James A. Wechsler, an ex-Communist and now editor of the Liberal *New York Post,* wrote in the *Progressive*:

> Faith in Soviet Russia was the grand illusion of American liberalism —It was in the mid-thirties when for the first time in American history the Communist Party influenced the nation's intellectual climate.

Fred Rodell, Liberal Yale law professor, writing in the same issue, said:

> Back in the middle and late 1930s —the line between the Communists and the non-Communist Liberals was sometimes, on the surface, paper thin.

Postwar Defense of Soviets

The pro-Communism of the Liberals which developed in the thirties carried over into the war and postwar years. Few of us remember the abuse which Liberals heaped upon Churchill after his "Iron Curtain" speech, delivered in 1946 at Westminister College, Fulton, Missouri. He was denounced in strong terms by the *Nation* and *New Republic,* Senators Pepper and Kilgore, Elliott and James Roosevelt, and Drew Pearson. The temper of the comments was indicated by the *New Republic*: "An obscene parallel has been drawn between the Soviet Government and the Nazis."

In 1946 Rep. Helen Gahagan Douglas and Senators Kilgore and Taylor were among the 16 New Dealers who joined the notorious Vito Marcantonio as congressional sponsors of the Communist-front "Win-the-Peace Committee." In May 1946 this committee passed a resolution condemning the United States and Britain for "the antagonism of the Western Allies to the new democratic and anti-fascist governments of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Hungary and Yugoslavia." Elliott Roosevelt went so far as to urge that the Dardenelles be given to the Soviet Union, and Senator Pepper made speeches in the Senate defending Russia's 1946 aggression in Iran.

If the general public has forgotten the rabid pro-Communism of the Liberals in the thirties and forties, the Liberals have not forgotten it. In fact, their remembrance of it and the feeling of guilt which accompanies this memory is the key to their present political attitudes and behavior. This does much to explain their favorable reaction to the Soviet attempt to revive the Popular Front.

The setback of the Popular Front after the brutalities in Hungary is only temporary. Soviet tactics are flexible and we may be sure the old and tried strategy will be revived at an early date. .

Life magazine, in its issue of June 25, 1956, in referring to Khrushchev's speech attacking Stalin, says:

> It may be part of a still bigger plot to entrap Liberals, Social Democrats, Socialists, etc., who were alienated by Stalin's despotism, into a new phase of fellow-travelling. But surely human gullibility must have some limits.

Ever since the Alger Hiss trial, our Liberals have been in deep trouble. Few of them were disloyal but nearly all of them were strongly involved emotionally in the Hiss trial —for they recognized that they themselves were on trial. Almost to a man they sprang to his defense. Diana Trilling, former fiction editor of the *Nation,* says:

> Most anti-Communist Liberals have been through the Communist mill, or frighteningly close to it. . . . They know not only how thin a line divided their own principles from Hiss' overt principles, but also how narrow a bridge Hiss had to span between his overt and his hidden beliefs. . . . And they defend him so absolutely, with such emotions of outrage at whoever thinks him guilty, because they dare not contemplate where they themselves might be blown by the uncharted winds of fashionable doctrine. Hiss must be innocent to prove that they are themselves innocent.

Can these "feelings of guilt" be the reason for Liberals' hatred of Nixon? Was his unforgivable crime his role in the imprisonment of Alger Hiss? Is their hatred of Nixon a pathological response to their feeling that they share the guilt of Alger Hiss?

Can it be that today the most important thing in life for a Liberal is somehow, some way, to rehabilitate himself in his own mind? Must he not only find excuses for his Communist involvements of the thirties and forties but also go further and prove that what he did then was right? Must he at all costs clear his own conscience?

To rehabilitate himself he must rehabilitate Communism as a decent and respectable philosophy of life. He must again believe the Communists are just "Liberals in a hurry." He must remove the label of "treason" from Communism.

To guilt-burdened Liberals the changing of the guard at the Kremlin has been a godsend. It permits the Liberal in search of rehabilitation to blame all the evils of Communism not upon Communists but upon one individual—Joseph Stalin. Thus his conscience is clear and he can believe that what he did in the thirties and forties to support Communism was justified.

The "Academic Freedom" Front

The first step in the Kremlin's campaign to revive the Popular Front is to make Communism respectable. In this the Communists have had the unwitting help of many Liberals and Liberal organizations.

For example, the highly respected American Association of University Professors has done much to make Communism respectable. That has not been their professed aim, but perhaps it has been their subconscious goal. Under the banner of academic freedom they have supported Communism and thus assailed the very foundations of academic freedom. They have done so by their preposterous proposal that Communists be employed to teach in our universities.

Arthur O. Lovejoy, one of the founders of the AAUP, in a 1949 article in the *American Scholar*, expressed views diametrically opposed to this position. He wrote:

> The employment of Communist teachers is inimical to academic freedom—that system [Communism] does not permit freedom of inquiry, of opinion and teaching either in or outside of universities.

The AAUP in its 42nd annual convention in St. Louis in 1956 adopted a report on "Academic Freedom and National Security" which not only upheld the practice of teachers accused of Communism to seek refuge in the Fifth Amendment but went farther and urged colleges and universities to employ Communists on their faculties. The report said:

> . . . it is desirable for adherents of Communism, like those of other forms of revolutionary thought, to present their views, especially in colleges and universities.

The report advocated that "representatives of Communism from abroad" be employed to teach in our universities under an exchange program. The report went on to state that if this were done "the unwisdom of the present academic policy [of not employing known Communists as teachers] would quickly become evident."

The report stated: "Simple membership in the [Communist] Party has not yet been clearly defined as illegal. The influence of the academic community should, we think, be directed against the proscription of membership. . . ."

Professor Sidney Hook of Columbia University, a former council member of the AAUP, makes an unanswerable case against the Association in the May 21, 1956 issue of the *New Leader* in his article "The AAUP and Academic Integrity." Professor Hook points out that membership in the Communist Party subjects a member to the discipline of the Party and hence deprives him of freedom of inquiry, of opinion and of teaching. He states that the AAUP's proposal to have Communists teach Communism in our colleges and universities is like employing "racists in order to study objectively the claims of racism, fascists to study fascism or bankrupts to study the laws of bankruptcy."

The twistings, the turnings and the squirmings of the academic mind in search of self-justification for its past Communist sympathies is illustrated by the case of Professor Herbert Fuchs. When Fuchs, a law professor at American University, testified before the House Un-American Activities Committee on June 13, 1955, to his own Communist activities, the University's president defended him. When he testified later, and named 44 of his past Communist associates, he was fired.

Thus the officials of the American University have defended the right of an ex-Communist to teach but have adopted the morally untenable position of punishing a man for putting loyalty to his country above loyalty to his Communist former associates. They have adopted the ethics of the criminal underworld whose chief commandment is "Thou shalt not squeal!"

In fairness, it must be pointed out that not all Liberals take this morally indefensible stand. The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Committee for Cultural Freedom have asked American University to reconsider its decision in the Fuchs case. Diana Trilling, chairman of the board of the ACCF and Reinhold Niebuhr, the noted theologian, denounced the action of the University.

The Liberal cannot escape from his feeling of guilt, but is under a terrific psychological compulsion to attempt to do so. In this psychological compulsion may lie the great danger of the revival of the Popular Front. The present professed aims (not the real aims) of American Communists are the same as those of American Liberals. They say that they, too, only "want to fight Senator McCarthy, stand up for civil rights and protect the consumer against the trusts."

AFL-CIO President George Meany in December 1955 warned Liberals against developing "a certain type of McCarthyism of their own." He warned that "they must shun like the plague the role of being anti-anti-Communist. Only by refusing to be thus entrapped can Liberals shed every vestige of their subconscious regard for Communism as a movement with which they have something in common."

The Communists again are offering, as they did in the thirties, to help the Liberal cause. The offer today is just as phony as it was in the thirties. It was sucker bait then. It is sucker bait now.

The THIRD WORLD WAR

JAMES BURNHAM

What the Hungarians Want

Hungary's 1956 "freedom revolution" —as it is called because of the parallel for Hungarian minds to the "freedom revolution" of 1848-49, which was also smashed by Russian troops—went through three plainly marked phases, apart from the long preliminary build-up and the aftermath that still continues. The first lasted from October 23, when shooting began, to October 31, when the last of the defeated Russian tanks withdrew from Budapest. Then, from October 31 to November 3, Hungary was free, and the Imre Nagy cabinet functioned as an independent government. At dawn on November 4 the reinforced Russians attacked throughout the country, and this third phase lasted until November 10, by which date large-scale organized fighting stopped. (Resistance in other forms, from guerrilla actions to passive sabotage, continues.)

The transcript of the internal broadcasts during those days by the various Hungarian radio stations is a wonderfully dramatic and illuminating—and tragic—document. Radio transcripts can almost be thought of as a new medium of historical understanding. Carefully interpreted they reflect not merely the narrative of events but the shifting power relations and the aims of the contending groups.

Beginning October 25 the stations were taken over, one after another, by the ascendant revolutionary forces, until on the afternoon of October 30 the central radio—Radio Budapest —became the free Radio Kossuth with a charmingly direct announcement: "For many years the radio has been an instrument of lies. . . . It lied day and night; it lied on all wave lengths. . . . We who are now at the microphone are new men. We shall tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth."

After November 4 the process was reversed. One after another, the free radio voices were silenced as the Soviet troops smashed in and took control. On the 9th regular broadcasting from free stations ended.

During the interlude of freedom, control of the radio stations was exercised by local contingents of the Freedom Fighters or by the quickly formed revolutionary committees and national committees. Along with news of the fighting, directives, etc., each station frequently turned its microphones over to trade union or peasant committees, writers' or student groups, and spokesmen of the political parties that began to function as the Communist political monopoly broke up.

Thus for the first time since the Communist vise was clamped on Eastern Europe, we learn through these transcripts what an East European people living under a Communist regime really wants. We listen not to the inferences of intelligence analysts or to refugees under the artificial conditions of exile, but to immediate spokesmen for the mass of the Hungarian nation. Of course, revolutionary circumstances are abnormal, and undoubtedly these initial "programs" would have been modified and developed if the revolution had been victorious. Still, they show directions, and they reveal much.

Although the different parties and localities had different stresses in their demands, and on some specific points conflicted, there was general agreement on the most important topics. Moreover, the government of Imre Nagy began to act, from October 30 on, in the sense of the common program that the Hungarian nation spontaneously adopted.

In a broadcast November 1, Nagy summed up accurately what the nation had shown that it wanted: a "free, independent, democratic and neutral Hungary."

On the political and social side the demands were for representative democracy, with freedom of political opposition, abolition of the political police, a multi-party election, and "freedom of speech, press, assembly and religion." These demands were carried remarkably far into practice for so short a time. There had been five Budapest newspapers, all Communist-controlled. By November 3 there were twenty-five, including journals for each of the opposition parties. These parties were functioning publicly, proclaiming views and recruiting members.

The churches, both Catholic and Protestant, the synagogues and the organized religious communities came to life. Freedom of religious training was not only proclaimed but exercised. Cardinal Mindszenty was freed, and said Mass in the Budapest cathedral.

It seems probable that there were implicit limits to the idea of political freedom. It was assumed that there was no basis in Hungarian life for fascist, monarchist or "reactionary" political tendencies.

All groups agreed that compulsory farm collectivization and compulsory delivery of farm produce were to be stopped. Peasants already in collectives were to be free to dissolve them if they chose. Workers were to regain the right to strike, and trade union officials were to be chosen freely by the workers instead of being appointed by the state. The workers' councils demanded a voice in running the factories. It was agreed in general that there should be freedom for individual enterprise in the professions, crafts and small retail trade, but apparently assumed that government ownership and control would continue in large industry. Many broadcasts, however, insisted that Hungary would not bring back "the landlords, big capitalists or mining tycoons."

The main principles of an initial foreign policy were not in dispute: *independence* and *neutrality*. This meant, to begin with: withdrawal of Soviet troops; publication and review of all secret agreements with Moscow (including the economic and uranium agreements that were keeping Hungary in bondage); Hungary's renunciation of the Warsaw Pact; formal declaration of neutrality.

In their outlook and aims, there is no reason to suppose that the other East European peoples differ materially from the Hungarians.

ARTS and MANNERS

WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM

The Unquiet Englishman

Mr. Graham Greene, an unquiet Englishman, continues to wrestle with his God and is currently staging a return bout at the Bijou Theater. Having greatly enjoyed several of Mr. Greene's lighter entertainments, I would be only too happy to report that his *The Potting Shed* is at least a draw. But I am committed to my prejudiced view of the truth just as much as Mr. Greene is committed to seeing himself as a cosmic messenger. So I am compelled to report that, this time, his message is not only irrelevant but also misspelled.

The Potting Shed is Mr. Greene's version of a miracle play. In a past that was wiser and more innocent than our times, the miracle play was a perfectly normal and almost trite dramatic form: Divine intervention, unpredictable and unfathomable, was understood to be not only a necessary but also an effective part of life's great design. Today, it is quite an undertaking to write a miracle play; and one would have expected Mr. Graham Greene to be so bold—if only because he is, without a doubt, the most arrogant writer of the day. (This is not a criticism but a statement of fact—a fact that becomes incontrovertibly manifest each time Mr. Greene yields to the temptation to write about humility. He then performs as if he had made a bet to prove that, if he so chooses, he can bloody well be the humblest writer in the trade.)

In *The Potting Shed,* Mr. Greene means to demonstrate that Faith, Love and Hope belong together, but the greatest of these is Faith. This, of course, is a slightly heretical view, as the lead part, orthodoxly, goes to Love. Nor does Mr. Greene set much stock in Hope—Hope being despised in the existentialist circles that spread Mr. Greene's fame. So Faith is all Mr. Greene is left to work with in *The Heart of the Matter,* in *The End of the Affair* and, this time, in *The Potting Shed*—Faith, very little Hope, and distinctly no Love.

James Callifer (played by Mr. Robert Flemyng with a chilly and chilling intelligence) moves through life as a kind of a zombie, incapable of response or recall; he cannot, in spite of the services rendered by a Central-European psychoanalyst, remember any particle of his life before he was fourteen. He then discovers that, at the age of fourteen, the impudent agnosticism of his father had driven him to suicide.

It was a successful suicide. But Father William Callifer, the youngster's uncle, offered God a prayerful bargain: "Take away my faith, if you only let this boy live again!" Which is exactly the miracle that happens: James is resurrected, and Father Callifer lives the next thirty years as a drunken hypocritical priest without faith. Yet once James discovers the truth, the priest recovers his faith, James' agnostic mother sees the light, and the curtain comes down.

But the whole dramatic structure collapses at what is meant to be the climactic moment of the play—the meeting of James and Father Callifer. Let us assume that it is theologically permissible and esthetically forgivable to introduce a priest who, for thirty years, celebrates mass without believing in what he is doing and proudly admits as much to anyone who wants to listen. This, of course, is a stupid assumption. But self-confessed Catholic writers like Mr. Greene seem to be able to get away with the kind of anti-Catholic calumny that the dumbest agnostic wouldn't dare nowadays. So let us accept the impossible assumption. Still, the situation is *intellectually* unacceptable.

The climax of the play violates the intellectual sensitivity of the believers as well as the agnostics in Mr. Greene's audience for a very simple reason: the author himself has given no thought to his premise. For, while it is conceivable that James Callifer lives thirty years without knowing what happened before and after he hanged himself, it is inconceivable that Father Callifer had no idea either. Mr. Greene does not even claim for the priest a loss of memory; so he simply must remember that he *had* offered God his faith in exchange for the boy's life. And, having been trained to believe very literally in God's effectiveness, the priest *could* not have been so idiotically dumfounded when he was taken at his word.

But, above all, it is intellectually offensive to grant that a man pure and whole and saintly enough to have his prayerful bargain accepted by the Lord could *then* carry on, not just without faith, but in base hypocrisy. And, on top of it, it is utterly unacceptable that such a man—just because he learns that the boy he *knew* to have been miraculously resurrected thirty years ago *was* indeed alive—could suddenly recover his faith.

Unacceptable, that is, if one is not prepared to assume a chain reaction of miracles throughout the play. Nothing, of course, is impossible for God, and if He so chooses, He might even let a still-born play come to life. But the point is that no one, not even a self-appointed Catholic fashion writer, must ever *count* on miracles. No man has a right to bet on Divine intervention. In particular, a playwright who, instead of doing his homework, relies on miracles, will produce a flop.

Whether *The Potting Shed* will be a flop at the box office is just as unpredictable as the theatrical con-game itself. This time, not even the production is especially excellent. The famous Dame Sybil Thorndike, though unquestionably competent, left me strangely cold. Sir Lewis Casson, playing a sophomoric caricature of an agnostic scientist, came up with a sophomoric caricature. Frank Conroy, who has to struggle with the most unlikely part, the priest, struggled manfully but unstruck by miracles. And Miss Leueen Macgrath, playing James Callifer's divorced wife, discharged her phony duties with a falsetto in voice as well as in posture.

If *The Potting Shed* had been written by Mr. Moss Hart, one could hopefully say that the author might still see the light and leap into importance. But it is by Mr. Graham Greene who claims to have seen *all* the light there is. Considering the author's faith, it's a hopeless play.

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Nostalgia for Heroes

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

As a contemporary novelist John Dos Passos has found it increasingly difficult to come upon a theme that is capable of feeding his imagination. His recent *Most Likely to Succeed*, the story of a fellow-traveling careerist who hit several new lows for abject bootlicking, nearly perished under the weight of auctorial contempt for the material at hand. As a student of the eighteenth century, however, John Dos Passos finds himself nourished, happy and creative. The novelist has been successfully reborn in the historian, and great works are in the making as Mr. Dos Passos plunges into libraries with all the gusto he once exhibited in traveling about the world.

Mr. Dos Passos' latest venture in his new field is a long, rich survey of the twenty-year period in American history which began with the British surrender at Yorktown and ended with the election of Thomas Jefferson to the Presidency in 1801. Called *The Men Who Made the Nation* (Doubleday, $5.95), this panorama of the Federalist epoch is enrolled in a lively series of intermingling biographies of Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, Lafayette, Tom Paine, Robert Morris, Gouverneur Morris, Benjamin Franklin and others too numerous to list. The fast-clicking word pictures are not limited to America, for Dos Passos has a keen awareness of the interrelatedness of all the late eighteenth century struggles to lay the ghost of the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings. With the astounding success of the American Constitutional Convention of 1787 constantly in mind, he is able to convey the full enormity of the travesty on liberty that came out of the sharply divergent course of the French Revolution. The French disaster, in turn, enhances the underlying theme of the book, which is Madisonian in its insistence on the idea that sovereignty must be "sufficiently neutral between different parts of the Society to controul one part from invading the right of another, and at the same time sufficiently controuled itself, from setting up an interest adverse to that of the entire Society." (The words and the spelling within the quotation are Madison's own.)

By native disposition Mr. Dos Passos is a Jeffersonian. This comes out in a wide variety of ways in *The Men Who Made the Nation*. It is apparent in the loving picture of George Mason, the Virginian who was the first to deplore publicly the absence of a Bill of Rights in the original Constitution; in the tenderness of every word devoted to Jefferson himself; and in the humorous relish with which Mr. Dos Passos fixes on sarcastic contemporary references to Federalists, such as the description of John Adams as His Rotundity. But if Mr. Dos Passos is still enough of the old-time Populist radical to refer to Hamilton's supporters as the "moneymen" (printed as one word in the *Manhattan Transfer* manner), he has an enlightened sense that what may be good for the rich is not *ipso facto* bad for the poor.

Thus Mr. Dos Passos' portrait of Alexander Hamilton in action is always sympathetic, admiring and understanding. The speculators who bought up the old Continental paper may have made a killing on Hamilton's funding operations and assumption of state debts, but Mr. Dos Passos doesn't leap from this to a conclusion that funding was unjustified. The Hamiltonian measures happened to be good for the Republic as a whole as well as for the speculative interests which correctly guessed the way the monetary cat would jump.

Mr. Dos Passos is able to write of the Republic's birthtime with élan for a simple reason: he finds the late eighteenth century replete with characters who measure up to Ortega y Gasset's definition of the hero as one who tries deliberately to shape his life in consonance with a disinterested idea of nobility. In the young days of the nation the world was full of commoners who were natural aristocrats. Hamilton himself was a case in point. Born the "bastard brat of a Scots pedlar" (to use John Adams' exasperated description of his rival for Federalist leadership), Hamilton was a man on the make. But there were certain things which Hamilton would not do to achieve or to hold power. He had an easy and tempting opportunity to frame an enemy, Hugh Brackenbridge, during the suppression of the Western Pennsylvania Whisky Rebellion, but even in the heat of partisan battle Hamilton would not attack an innocent man on a technicality. He could have advanced himself in the Federalist Party by supporting Aaron Burr for the Presidency against Jefferson in the Electoral College mix-up in 1801, but he could not bring himself to champion the less able man. "Jefferson," he wrote to Oliver Wolcott, "is to be preferred. He is by far not so dangerous a man; and he has pretensions to character. As to Burr . . . he is bankrupt beyond redemption except by plunder of his country." Though Hamilton had every reason to hate Jefferson, and though "with Burr I have always been personally well," he paid with his life for his courageous stand when Burr killed him in the Weehawken duel.

Mr. Dos Passos, though he has romantic longings for the life of the Virginia upland frontier of Jefferson's day, is able to deal fairly with such

things as Hamilton's Report on Manufactures out of sheer admiration for Hamilton's integrity as a public figure. Hamilton, he notes, died poor. So, for that matter, did Robert Morris, the financier of the American Revolution. But where Morris lost his money in a spectacular bankruptcy after a career of using Treasury information to further his own private ends, Hamilton never made money out of a privileged position in the first place. When he needed money he earned it laboriously, as a lawyer who kept his fees to a decent minimum.

Although Mr. Dos Passos thoroughly enjoys writing about the clash of ideas, he has not forgotten his novelist's love of personal idiosyncracy. He is as much interested in Washington's seat on a horse as he is in the details of Yorktown or Washington's ideas on government. Jefferson's relations with his motherless daughters, who continually tugged at the heartstrings of the Virginia *philosophe*, get as much attention here as the Jeffersonian efforts to abolish slavery or the law of entail. And Jefferson, the architect of Monticello, is always worth as much space with Mr. Dos Passos as Jefferson, the architect of the Declaration of Independence.

The unstressed message of *The Men Who Made the Nation* is that we have come a long way down in public morals since the Federalist epoch. In those days if a man said he was going to fight inflation, or oppose the ideas of Robespierre (the contemporary version of Stalinism), you could take him at his word. Not so today. Ortega y Gasset's hero is selling at a discount, and when an occasional Charlie Wilson refuses to apologize for honest speech it is enough to make front-page news. Small wonder that Mr. Dos Passos, to get a breath of clean air, has rushed for those library stacks.

A NEW eye-opening attack on the abuses of unionism . . .

THE

LABOR POLICY

OF THE

FREE SOCIETY

Sylvester Petro — one-time steel worker and unionizer, now Professor of Law at New York University—traces the evolution of U.S. labor policy and calls for wholesale reform in this challenging book. Dr. Petro, former editor of the Commerce Clearing House "Labor Law Reports," holds that freedom, well-being, and security can be attained only in a society which adheres on the workingman's level to principles of free enterprise and private property. He calls for abolition of the NLRB and shows how existing laws should be applied to unions to eliminate picketing, secondary boycotts, compulsory membership, etc. *"One of the most significant books of this generation."* — LAWRENCE FERTIG, *N.Y. World Telegram & Sun, Scripps-Howard Newspapers*

$5 at bookstores

THE RONALD PRESS COMPANY, N.Y.

To order any book reviewed in this book section, write:

THE BOOKMAILER

Box 101, Murray Hill Station
New York 16, N.Y.

Return mail service—postpaid

PAY ONLY BOOKSTORE PRICE

$.....payment enclosed

Please send me: .....
(name of book)

.....

.....

Name .....

Address .....

.....

(No C.O.D. orders accepted; payment MUST accompany order. N.Y. City residents add 3% tax.)

Masks of Communism

Khrushchev and Stalin's Ghost, by Bertram D. Wolfe. 322 pp. New York: Frederick A. Praeger. $3.95

National Communism and Popular Revolt in Eastern Europe: A Selection of Documents on Events in Poland and Hungary, February-November, 1956, edited by Paul E. Zinner. 563 pp. New York: Columbia University Press. $2.95

Still, after all the years and all the shocks (the liquidation of the kulaks, the Moscow trials, the Katyn massacre, the Hungarian massacre), and despite the massive evidence of the permanence of Communism's underlying character, Communism remains a mystery to most of our statesmen and publicists, to say nothing of our scholars.

Everyone agrees that, of course, Communism is bad. But its badness varies, depending upon the surface circumstances, sometimes, as from 1942 to 1945, approaching goodness. Now, once again, with the death of Stalin, the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the de-Stalinization campaign, and recent developments in the satellites, the badness of Communism is beginning to climb the scale. Some Communists, Gomulka and Tito, for example, are rapidly approaching goodness, like the Chinese "agrarian reformers" of blessed memory before them.

The virtue of these two books lies in their conclusive demonstration that the substance of Communism does not change with the death of leaders, the victory or defeat of factions, or the geographical expansion of the Communist empire. Bertram Wolfe's book presents Khrushchev's secret speech at the 20th Congress, and a number of related documents, as the basis for his coherent and compelling consideration of recent Soviet developments in the light of the whole history of Bolshevism. Picking up Khrushchev's "revelations" and protestations point by point, Wolfe shows conclusively, by detailed historical and theoretical analysis, the firm continuity of purpose, method, and action that unites Lenin with Stalin and Stalin with his "de-Stalinized" successors.

Mr. Wolfe admits no fundamental ideological or political differences between Stalin and his heirs, Khrushchev or Malenkov, Beria or Bulganin. Looking at the successive waves of Western optimism that have followed Stalin's death, the Geneva Conference, and the 20th Party Congress, he concludes that it is only "the pathetic eagerness of the world to be deceived that magnifies these played out and trivial concessions and maneuvers into something big, portending fundamental change."

As the evidence Mr. Wolfe presents shows the continuity of Communism in Russia, so the documents as-

sembled in *National Communism and Popular Revolt in Eastern Europe* demonstrate the homogeneity of the Communism of Gomulka and Tito, Hoxha and Kadar, with that of the Soviet Union.

It is a pity that the material available in these documents is not interpreted by someone of Mr. Wolfe's ability. The documents are, in fact, presented without any interpretation. But to the reader acquainted with Communist rhetoric and logic, the speeches and resolutions and editorials here included show clearly that, despite the internecine differences, these are Communists—speaking, thinking, feeling, and acting like Communists. Those who are less knowledgeable in this field have only to read Mr. Wolfe's book first and then apply his method to these documents. They form a perfect pendant to his thesis. FRANK S. MEYER

A Joke on the French

Franklin and His French Contemporaries, by Alfred Owen Aldridge. 260 pp. New York: New York University Press. $4.75

Although it contains a few rather ludicrous blunders (two on p. 119), this is a satisfactory account of Franklin's reputation in France in his own day, and provides, *inter alia*, some amusing illustrations of the credulity of the self-styled *philosophes* ("intellectuals"). Poor Richard's exhortations about thrift and industry seemed to them a "sublime morality" and proof that Franklin was the incarnation of "the simplicity and innocence of primitive morals." Two of his satirical stories were solemnly translated as documents which proved that savages necessarily think noble thoughts, and that women who give birth to a series of assorted bastards necessarily have noble souls.

All this must have amused Franklin immensely, but he was a supple diplomat willing to play any role that would serve his purpose, and he politely refrained from adding to Poor Richard's collection an aphorism which might have read, "When thou hearest men prating of the Rights of Man, know them to be sentimental suckers." REVILO OLIVER

REVIEWED IN BRIEF

An Age of Fiction, by Germaine Bree and Margaret Guiton. 242 pp. Rutgers University Press. $5.00

Early in this study of the French novel's renaissance since 1914 the authors speak of "a movement away from fictional forms," and the novel's recent tendency toward the essay, the journal, the more personal avowal. Oddly, then, their book spends most of its pages digesting the plots of such wholly undistinguished fictioneers as Aragon, Bosco, Aymé, etc.; and even more oddly, it omits any consideration of, for instance, Montherlant, Jouhandeau, Genet, or even Colette, whose works are among the best examples extant of the novel-turned-testament. Since Miss Bree has elsewhere written excellently on Proust, the only explanation seems to be an earnest wish to cater to the resolutely provincial taste of "college French" departments.

The Day the Money Stopped, by Brendan Gill. 193 pp. Doubleday. $2.95

A rakish black-sheep son gets an abrupt comeuppance the morning he discovers that his papa's will has left him nothing but a gold watch. But he has not been a bounder for nothing. Before lunch, he has not only blackmailed his relatives and made a date with a pretty young thing who appears to be his bastard half-sister; he has also talked his way into—at a conservative estimate—a full season of bestsellerdom, nine months on Broadway, and a year in Hollywood.

Nina, by Luise Rinser. Translated by Richard and Clara Winston. 284 pp. Regnery. $3.75

Nina is a woman who above all believes in giving herself to life with open hands. She suffers, causes suffering, even loses the only man she loves, but in the end regrets nothing. Though her story relies a little ponderously on annotated letters and diaries, its insight into the intricate morality of loving and being loved is always subtle and sure. *Nina* should find Miss Rinser enough American readers to insure her regular importation from now on.

Journals of Jean Cocteau. Edited and translated by Wallace Fowlie. 250 pp. Criterion. $6.00

Just as there is a criminal in Villon, a snob in Henry James, a shrill actor in Shakespeare, so there is, in Cocteau, an exhibitionist, an arty ringmaster, the Pied Piper who has been leading flossy Parisians for fifty years, and who frequently gets very tiresome. But there is also the true poet who watches whatever he loves with awe, and then finds memorable words to praise it. What Cocteau loves, of course, is the very act of being a poet—its risks, nimbleness, narcissism, despairs, triumphs. The present "journals" (which Wallace Fowlie has selected from several books) are not a diary, so much as a sort of Poetics—though not by Aristotle, this time, but by Orpheus himself.

The Selected Writings of Sydney Smith. Edited, with an introduction, by W. H. Auden. 366 pp. Farrar, Straus & Cudahy. $6.50.

The difference between a liberal and a Liberal continues to vex the language. The former means a man who, one hundred years ago, had an unossified mind. The latter, as Auden's preface points out, is today's "professional Liberal who assumes that in every issue the liberal position must be on the Left." Priggish, conformist, prone to wide generalities, and fearing nothing so much as his own example, this Liberal still—paradoxically—claims the original liberal as an ancestor. It is probably too much to hope that he will read very far into this anthology of Sydney Smith's polemics, but if he does, he'll get a shock. For this worldly old canon of St. Paul's was not only the wittiest Whig of his day (*i.e.*, a liberal), he was also a man for whom, in Auden's words, "Utopians are a public menace." His shrewd, gamey common sense and charity should make the contemporary Liberal look for a new label.

(Reviewed by Roger Becket)

To the Editor

"The First 'R'"

Mr. Kalish's article, "The First 'R'" [February 2], should be must reading for all parents. Having recently had the rewarding experience of teaching my five-year-old to read, I can testify to the complete success of the phonics method. . . .

Phonics is a slow grind at first (for two months, in the case of my own child). But once a few simple fundamentals are mastered, the child has the key so that he himself can unlock the words. He is not dependent on pictures, or teacher dramatics described by Mr. Kalish.

Now in the second grade, my six-year-old can read like an adult—and he can read interesting books which stimulate the desire to learn. He is completely emancipated from the endless repetition of banalities uttered by Alice and Jerry, Dick and Jane. . . .

Alton, Ill. PHYLLIS STEWART SCHLAFLY

Congratulations for your foresight in printing Abe Kalish's article on the inadequacies of teaching reading in public elementary schools. I found it stimulating and thought-provoking.

Goshen, N.Y. JOSEPH A. FIORIVANTI

The Origin of Freedom

In his article "What Is the Republic?" [February 2], Russell Kirk sweepingly covers the basis of the conservatives' traditional support of our basic political philosophy. But it seems to me that he fails to clarify, if he does not actually overlook, two fundamental American principles, one of which is unique with us.

That one is that we neither seek, claim nor demand rights from the state. All political rights are ours from God, subject only to such restrictions as we put on them by the limited powers given by us to the state through the Constitution.

The other principle is that ours should be a government of laws, not of men. This principle has been observed too often in the breach, of late. . . .

New York City ALFRED KOHLBERG

New Blood

Congratulations on the fine additions to your editorial staff [L. Brent Bozell and John Chamberlain]. NR gets better all the time. The articles by James Burnham and Richard Weaver in the January 19 issue are outstanding.

Los Angeles, Cal. RICHARD DE MILLE

Self-Investment

The recent [February 9] "Ivory Tower" suggestion that men might be glad to invest in themselves has the double merit of simplicity and logic.

When I attended college nearly a half-century ago they had a "Junior-Senior Loan Fund" used by men who decided that a bit less outside work and better use of the opportunities within the college might warrant the debt. I used it for three years. There was also a provision that no interest would be payable if repayment were promptly made. . . .

Washington, D.C. W. RULON WILLIAMSON

For Euthanasia Within the Law

. . . I cannot agree with your stand regarding euthanasia in the February 9 issue. . . .

You base your opposition [in part] upon the wording of the Hippocratic oath taken by all physicians, which reads in part as follows—"That you will exercise your art solely for the cure of your patients and will give no drug, perform no operation, for a criminal purpose, even if solicited, far less suggest it. . . ." However, if the State of New Jersey by a duly enacted law says that, in that jurisdiction, euthanasia may be performed under proper restrictions and according to the terms of the law, it is obviously not done "for a criminal purpose" and therefore not contrary to the physician's oath.

As to the part of the oath which says "solely for the cure," it would logically seem that, if a patient is suffering from an incurable disease . . . that part of the oath has no significance.

Bangor, Me. IRVING G. STETSON

Spiritual Uplift

Please accept this expression of my delight on reading Mr. Schlamm's sparkling articles in NATIONAL REVIEW. The contributions of Frank Meyer and Willi Schlamm give me, for one, a bit of spiritual uplift seldom experienced outside the columns of this journal of opinion.

Jackson, Mich. N. C. SCHRADER

We know you love your country, but—

Are you as effective as you would like to be in your own efforts to preserve American liberty and independence?

A two weeks' course in the American philosophy of libertarianism is available for a limited number of patriots who care. Enrollment applications are now being received. Write for free information:

The Freedom School
Box 165, Colorado Springs, Col.

NEUTRALIZATION

(*Continued from p.* 178)

rectly finds Mr. Burnham ambiguous. If it is true that the United States prefers freedom to war it is also true that the policy of the United States has been—and here is a reality for Mr. Burnham to chew on—to reduce her exposure to the test of that preference. Now we have before us the suggestion that we add whole nations to our protectorate.

If the Burnham Plan were, in the course of time, to have the desired effect of loosening Soviet control over its satellite empire, the temptation to the Communists to reassert control in contravention of the relevant treaty, would probably prove irresistible. But the determination of the West to uphold the treaty might not prove irresistible: hence the Soviet Union might march—to and past the frontier of the most vital Western bulwark in Europe, West Germany.

So long as the Burnham Plan does not carry as an integral feature of it a guarantee by the West, explicitly backed up by a commitment to use every weapon in the Western arsenal necessary to defend the new frontier, it strikes me as unwise to adopt it. For the stake, West Germany, is too high.

We had a lot of "exploring" to do . . . before we could bring you KENNAMETAL*

When you see Kennametal being used in woodworking, metal-cutting, coal and mineral mining, or as a vital machine part where abrasion is a problem—you probably never dream of all the *exploring* that had to be done before it reached its final form.

First . . . exploring desert and jungle for sources of better essential ores. Next . . . exploring improved methods of reducing and refining the ores, to usable ingredients. Next . . . exploring to discover ways that will better yield tungsten carbide metal with properties required for specific applications.

The result has been a dependable, hard alloy that outperforms and outlasts other metals in the metalworking, mining, woodworking and other industries.

Thus, with Kennametal, American industry gets a "plus" that comes from this exploration and from quality control from "mine to machine" . . . a plus that helps to speed up production and lower costs. KENNAMETAL INC., Latrobe, Pennsylvania.

In the absence of a Gold Standard to stop inflationary forces, the great savings made possible by Kennametal have been eaten up in helping to retard the rate of inflation. If you wish to enjoy the benefit of those industrial savings in the form of lower prices for goods you buy, you should work for the re-establishment of a Gold Coin Standard. Discuss it with neighbors, friends, public officials and candidates for office.

*Kennametal is the registered trademark of a series of hard carbide alloys of tungsten, tungsten-titanium and tantalum, for tooling in the metalworking, mining and woodworking industries and for wear parts in machines and process equipment. Kennametal is being used advantageously in practically every industry.

B-5939

One of a series of advertisements in the public interest

INDUSTRY AND
KENNAMETAL
. . . Partners in Progress